

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/067,324	02/07/2002	Mutsumi Harada	. X2007.0002/P002	4579
7590 10/19/2004 DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP 1177 Avenue of the Americas			EXAMINER	
			DUONG, THANH P	
New York, NY	10036-2714		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1764	
			DATE MAILED: 10/19/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			11
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/067,324	HARADA ET AL.	/
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tom P Duong	1764	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence addre	ess
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR I THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a retion. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT or statute. Cause the application to become AR.	rply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this command	nunication.
Status			
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is FINAL. 3) Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice un 	This action is non-final. Ilowance except for formal matte		erits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 and 13-18 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wi 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 and 13-18 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction.	thdrawn from consideration.		8
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exact 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control of the oath or declaration is objected to by the specific sheet is a specific sheet (s).	accepted or b) objected to be to the drawing(s) be held in abeyand correction is required if the drawing(s	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International B * See the attached detailed Office action for	ments have been received. ments have been received in Ap e priority documents have been r sureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Sta	nge
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Su 8) Paper No(s) 6B/08) 5) Notice of Info 6) Other:	Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-15	2)

Application/Control Number: 10/067,324

Art Unit: 1764

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- 1. Claims 1-7 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kobayashi (6,558,273). Regarding claims 1-2 and 13-18, Kobayashi discloses a metal golf club head (Fig. 2), comprising: a ball hitting face (16) made of a metal (Col. 4, lines 20-21), which includes a central portion (as shown on Fig. 2) and a peripheral portion surrounding at least a part of said central portion (as shown on Fig. 2). With respect to the hardness of the metal at said peripheral portion is lower than the hardness of the metal at said central portion, Kobayashi discloses the face member is subject to direct aging treatment to improve surface hardness (Col. 6, lines 11-14) and further discloses the outer periphery of the face member is welded to the body member 17 after heat treatment. Note, it is known in the golf club art that the surface hardness is reduced in the affected welding zone area (See USPN 6,280,349 and USPN 5,275,409). In light of applicants' specification (page 8, lines 5-15), it is inherent and/or obvious in view of Kobayashi to one having ordinary skill in the art that the face member of Kobayashi has a higher

Art Unit: 1764

surface hardness in the central portion than its periphery portion being the fact that the periphery portion are subjected to the affected welding area, which has a lower surface hardness than the central portion (unwelded surface area). Regarding claims 3 and 4, Kobayashi does not disclose the method of determining the hardness difference between the central portion and its periphery portion; however, it is inherent and/or obvious in view of Kobayashi to one having ordinary skill in the art that the face member of Kobayashi has a hardness difference between the central portion and its periphery portion as described above. With respect to claims 5-7, Kobayashi does not disclose the difference in the hardness between said central portion and periphery portion is equal to or greater than 50 in terms of the Vickers hardness. However, Kobayashi discloses the face material with heat treatment and welding technique of the claimed invention; thus, it is inherent and/or obvious in view of Kobayashi to one having ordinary skill in the art that the face member of Kobayashi exhibits the hardness characteristics of the claimed invention. Note, when the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). See MPEP 2112.01.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. USPN 6,280,349 and USPN 5,275,409 disclose the hardness of the material is reduced in the affected welding zone.

Application/Control Number: 10/067,324

Art Unit: 1764

Page 4

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tom P Duong whose telephone number is (571) 272-2794. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tom Duong October 5, 2004

Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700

70